

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-16, 18-33, and 35-41 remain pending, of which claims 1, 15, and 24 have been amended.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, Applicant and Applicant's attorney express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on September 19, 2006. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview.

In the ninth paragraph, the Office action rejects independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Korpi* in view of *Thom* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,856,676 B1 to Pirot et al. ("*Pirot*"). In paragraph 13, the Office action rejects independent claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Korpi*, *Thom*, and *Pirot*, and in further view of "C6x Solutions for Voice over IP Gateway" by Cassing ("*Cassing*"). In addition, the Office action rejects independent claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Korpi*, *Thom*, and *Pirot*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application 2001/0046234 A1 by Agrawal et al. ("*Agrawal*") and "RFC 2806 – URLs for Telephone Calls" to A. Vaha-Sipila ("*Vaha-Sipila*"). For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection.<sup>2</sup>

As previously noted Applicant's invention relates to a method of allowing communication applicants to modify call detail records for services rendered on a per call record basis. Accordingly, within a call detail record, generic fields are provided that allow a central arbitration server to collect billing information for any application, without having to anticipate the application. As agreed to in the interview, the independent claims have been amended to make clear that the generic field within the call detail record can be populated by a plurality of applications to add information specific to services offered by each of the plurality of applications.

As discussed and generally agreed to during the interview, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest at least this added feature now presented in each of the independent claims.

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the Specification, and more specifically, *see e.g.*, p. 33, ll. 1-16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

As such, the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise make obvious applications claimed invention.

More specifically, as previously noted in other communications, *Korpi* discloses supplementary service in the H.323 IP telephony network. Similarly, *Thom* discloses an overview of H.323, which is a visual telephone system and equipment for LANs that provide a non-guaranteed quality of service (QoS). Further, *Cassing* discloses solutions for voice over IP gateways. In addition, *Agrawal* discloses a method and apparatus for use in telecommunication systems supporting inter-working between H.323 packet-based multimedia communication systems and the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP). Finally, *Vaha-Sipila* discloses a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) scheme for “tele”, “fax”, and “modem” for specifying the location of a terminal in the phone network and the connection types (modes of operation) that can be used to connect to that entity.

As acknowledged by the Office action the combination of *Korpi*, *Thom*, *Cassing*, *Agrawal*, and/or *Vaha-Sipila*—either taken individually or as a whole—is silent regarding a call detail record with extensible generic fields. As such, the combination of *Korpi*, *Thom*, *Cassing*, *Agrawal*, and/or *Vaha-Sipila* cannot possibly disclose or suggest a central arbitration server (CAS) that provides a “generic field within the call detail record that can be populated by a plurality of applications to add information specific to services offered by each of the plurality of applications.”

Recognizing the deficiencies of *Korpi*, *Thom*, *Cassing*, *Agrawal*, and *Vaha-Sipila*, the Office action cites *Pirot*. *Pirot* discloses a system and method of controlling and managing voice and data services in a telecommunications network. Although *Pirot* discloses a call detail record (CDR), *Pirot* does not disclose or suggest that such CDR has extensible fields that can be modified by a plurality of applications—as noted in the Interview Summary. In fact, as discussed during the interview, when discussing the CDRs, *Pirot* implies that the call detail records are totally tailored billing mechanisms for individual users and applications (*see, e.g.*, col. 14, ll. 21-30). As such, *Pirot* actually “teaches away” from applications claimed generic field within the call detail record that can be populated by a plurality of applications to add information specific to services offered by each of the plurality of applications.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art fails to anticipate or otherwise make obvious Applicant's invention, as claimed for example, in independent claims 1, 15, and 24. Applicant notes for the record that the remarks above render the remaining rejections of record for the independent and dependent claims moot, and thus addressing individual rejections or assertions with respect to the teachings of the cited art is unnecessary at the present time, but may be undertaken in the future if necessary or desirable, and Applicant reserves the right to do so.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should any question arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at +1.801.533.9800.

Dated this 22 day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/Wesley C. Rosander, Reg. # 51,030  
Wesley C. Rosander

JONATHAN W. RICHARDS  
Registration No. 29,843  
WESLEY C. ROSANDER  
Registration No. 51,030  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913